

is seeking and which his supporters in the Senate are trying to carve out room in the budget resolution to accommodate, shows that almost half of the benefits of the proposed tax cut will go to the top 1 percent of the population. Almost three-quarters of it goes to the top 5 percent of the population. The proposed tax cut is very heavily skewed toward those at the very top of the income and wealth scale in this country; this at the very time when the Nation is being rallied, as it should be, to support our men and women in the Armed Forces. This at the very time when we are talking about sacrifice. And it is appropriate that we should talk about sacrifice at a time like this because one cannot follow the events taking place now in Iraq without some deep appreciation of the sacrifice our fighting men and women are making and the risks they are taking every minute.

What sacrifice are those who are most favored in our society in terms of their economic position making at this critical juncture in our history? Not only are they not making a sacrifice, they are getting a very large tax cut skewed to their benefit which, in turn, will put our economy in a more difficult position into the future. It will build up deficits and debt which the fighting men and women, when they return home, will have to pay off well into the future. They are being called upon to make a double sacrifice, now and in the future.

What is the sacrifice here at home that the beneficiaries of this tax cut will be making? Winston Churchill, at the beginning of World War II, when he became Prime Minister, told his nation, "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

Our young men and women positioned in the Middle East are called upon to sacrifice even as we debate this budget resolution. There will be sweat. There will be tears. There will be toil. And there will be blood. What sacrifice will be made by those who are the most well off in our society? At a time when we face these critical challenges, should they not be making a contribution instead of reaping a large economic benefit?

Mr. President, I urge the defeat of this budget resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

DIPLOMACY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have heard on this floor and in the popular media that the main reason we are at war is because "diplomacy has failed," and there are those who have attacked the President for his "failure" in diplomacy. We also hear that polls are running heavily against the war.

My mind goes back to a somewhat similar situation in Great Britain when Neville Chamberlain returned from

Munich and said, "We have established peace in our time." He referred to the Czechs, whose country he gave to Adolf Hitler in this fashion:

Why should we consider people who live in a land far away and with whom we have little or nothing to do?

Winston Churchill opposed the treaty that Neville Chamberlain brought home from Munich. He offered stirring rhetoric, saying, "We have suffered a defeat of the first magnitude." That stirred my soul as a young schoolchild reading about it. What I didn't realize until I became an adult is that Winston Churchill got only three votes, as Parliament overwhelmingly endorsed Chamberlain. And the popular polls, as I say, made Chamberlain the most popular politician in Great Britain, and maybe in all of Europe. Of course, within 2 years, we found that Winston Churchill was right and Chamberlain went off to historical disgrace.

The Munich example is not exactly analogous to this situation. No historical situation is exactly analogous to a current circumstance, but it is one we should keep in mind as we hear rhetoric saying that diplomacy has failed. Diplomacy in Munich is what failed and the war followed.

The Senator from North Carolina has a resolution she wishes to offer with respect to the current British Prime Minister. I yield to her the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. DOLE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. DOLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 709 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. DOLE. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from North Dakota.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for this opportunity this morning to bring to my colleagues' attention where we stand with respect to the budget resolution that we will be completing today.

A very important report came out late yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office, which is nonpartisan, which is in charge of estimating the effects of what we do here. I might add, while the CBO is nonpartisan, because the Republicans control the House and the Senate, they were able to choose the new CBO Director. One of the tests they had was the use of so-called dynamic scoring. The gentleman who now heads CBO is committed to dynamic scoring, and he has now released an analysis of the budget before us based on dynamic scoring. His conclusion is exactly what I have been reporting to my colleagues day after day on the floor: Tax cuts will make the deficit soar.

I hope we can put this old canard to rest once and for all that somehow you can tax cut your way to prosperity when at the same time you are increasing spending. When you start from a base of record budget deficits, there can only be one result. When you start with record budget deficits and then cut your revenue stream, as the President has proposed, by nearly \$2 trillion and increase spending, the deficits and the debt are going to get bigger. The Congressional Budget Office is telling us that is exactly what we face.

There was another article in the Washington Post on this same story. They point out:

The CBO report also said the president's tax and spending proposals "imply a deficit in every year over the next decade," thus adding to the national debt and to the annual interest payments on that debt beyond 2013.

"For some time, that added need could be met by running higher deficits. However, the federal government could not follow such an approach indefinitely. At some point in the future under the president's proposals, either taxes would have to be higher than they otherwise would have been, or spending would have to be lower," the report said.

It is time we sober up around here. I do not know what happened to our friends on the other side who used to be fiscal conservatives, who used to believe in balanced budgets and now endorse tax cuts that are going to plunge us into deep deficit and debt.

This is the analysis again from the Congressional Budget Office of what the plan before us will do. This is the President's budget plan: a deficit next year of \$512 billion. That does not count the war costs. Add in the \$75 billion the President wants for the war, and the deficit next year will be \$587 billion. Does anybody have sticker shock around here yet? That is getting close to being twice as big as the previous record deficit.

The analysis shows we will not be out of deficit any year for the next 10 years. But that is not the most sobering effect. None of the deficits will be less than \$400 billion.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one quick question?

Mr. CONRAD. I will.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to be very clear. The Senator is saying the budget deficit for the next year will be close to \$600 billion, more than double the highest deficit we have ever run previously; is that correct?

Mr. CONRAD. That is exactly what we are being told by the Congressional Budget Office. We now face, if we adopt the President's plans for massive tax cuts on top of the spending increases for defense and homeland security, which we all endorse—we endorse the increased funds for defense and homeland security—that we are going to have budget deficits as far as the eye can see, and they are not going to be small deficits. They are going to be massive deficits.

This chart shows that, in fact, we are in the sweet spot now. This is not my

chart. This comes from the President's own document. It shows in the period we are in now that the deficits, although they are record levels, are going to get much bigger. As we approach the retirement of the baby boom generation and as we approach the full phasing in of the President's proposed tax cuts, at the very time the cost of the Federal Government explodes, the retirement of the baby boom generation, the cost of the President's tax cuts explode, sending us right off the cliff into deficits and debt that are totally unsustainable.

The other day one of our colleagues on the other side said Democrats were proposing spending that he suggested was just out of control. This chart shows the Democratic alternative we offered. This is a comparison of spending with the Republican plan, which is the green line, 18.8 percent of GDP; the blue line is our spending, 19.3 percent. One of the big reasons there is a difference is because we put the money in to pay for the war. We put the money in to pay for increased homeland security. So certainly we have more spending. We have more spending because we have responded to the President's call to put the spending in for the war. Our friends on the other side did not.

Let me go to the next chart quickly. He also showed what he called the Democrat spend-o-meter. We can look at the Republican debt-o-meter because what they are doing is running up the debt.

When the President took office, he told us that by 2008, there would only be \$36 billion of debt left. In his 2002 budget, he said—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONRAD. Let me complete this thought first, and then I will be happy to yield.

He had the debt run up to \$1.2 trillion after adopting his plans; in August of 2001, \$1.6 trillion. In February of 2002, with the President's 2003 budget, the debt is up to \$3.2 trillion. And if we adopt his budget for 2004, the debt by 2008 will be \$5 trillion.

I conclude by saying when we proposed additional spending to fund the war, to fund homeland security, and to improve education, we did it in a controlled way, every bit of it paid for, but we added deficit reduction so that we would have less deficit, less debt, a stronger economy, and more opportunity for the American people.

When I see in the newspapers the President in his plan is down to \$350 billion of tax cuts, oh, no, they are only looking at half the proposal. Right now the budget resolution that is before us has \$852 billion in tax cuts, not the \$350 billion that has been widely reported. When they are talking about the \$350 billion, they are talking about the reconciled tax cuts, those that will be given special consideration which cannot be filibustered. So the total tax cuts in this plan are \$852 billion.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask the ranking member of the Budget Committee, with these record deficits and this incredible buildup of debt which would flow out of the administration's policy, who is going to carry the burden of that debt? Will not the same men and women who are now fighting out in the Middle East, when they come home, have that debt settle upon them? And in the meantime, very big tax cuts are being given to very wealthy people. What sacrifice are the people who have been most favored in our society economically making in order to meet this economic crisis? There is no sacrifice on their part.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from New Mexico.

TRIBUTE TO THE BRAVE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the brave men and women who are serving our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan, three individuals in particular. First, I will speak briefly about SP Joseph Hudson. He is a 1998 graduate of Alamogordo High School in my State. He is a member of the 507th Maintenance Company out of Fort Bliss, TX, who was captured this past Sunday. His image was seen on a videotape by his wife and high school sweetheart, Natalie, and young daughter Cameron, and his mother Anecita, also of Alamogordo, as well as everyone around the world watching the television coverage of this war. Like them, we wait anxiously for any word about his well-being, and pray for his safe return.

While our attention is focused on the fierce conflict in Iraq, it is important to remember that there are also young men and women putting their lives on the line every day in the conflict in Afghanistan as well. Many of us in New Mexico got a terrible reminder of that on Sunday, when two young people with strong ties to New Mexico were killed attempting to help two Afghan children.

Air Force 1LT Tamara Long Archuleta was the copilot of the helicopter that crashed while on a rescue mission, killing all six aboard. Tammy was from Adelino, near Belen, NM, and her life was a shining example of the power of discipline, drive, and determination. Tammy was valedictorian of her class and a world karate champion. She graduated from the University of New Mexico with honors, and while there became involved with Air Force ROTC. She had wanted to become a fighter pilot, but instead decided to do rescue work. Her grandfather was a Navy pilot and her uncle a pararescue man, and Tammy had been strongly influenced by her family's dedication to service.

Tammy had a 3-year-old son and was to marry a fellow Air Force pilot soon. Sadly, she was scheduled to return

home in a mere 2 weeks. Words cannot express the grief many New Mexicans are feeling about the loss of this extraordinary young woman.

I would also add that New Mexico was twice touched by this tragedy, the loss of this helicopter. Another young man killed in the crash, SSG Jason Hicks, met his future wife, Cristy Nolan of Rio Rancho, NM, when he was in training at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque. We honor his memory as well as Tamara's.

We hope this is the end of the casualties and problems we see for the young men and women of our State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

IMMINENT DANGER PAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is the nature of our debate on the budget resolution that there is a very limited amount of time available to discuss amendments which we will be offering. I am taking this opportunity this morning to describe to my colleagues and those following the debate an amendment which I plan to offer this morning to the budget resolution.

All of us are transfixed by images that come over the television, as we listen to the radio, and as we read the newspaper about the war in Iraq. We are reminded on a minute-by-minute basis of the heroism, bravery, and determination of our Armed Forces.

Last week, there was a resolution commending the Armed Forces for their efforts, as well as standing, by the President as Commander in Chief as he leads these forces into battle. That resolution was enacted by a vote of 99 to 0, with all Senators present voting in favor of it—all Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. It is an indication of the solidarity in this Chamber behind the men and women in uniform.

The amendment which I will offer during the course of the budget resolution debate today will be further evidence of our solidarity behind the men and women in uniform. My colleagues may be surprised to learn that those who are serving in the military in Iraq are eligible for what is known as imminent danger pay, combat pay. It is one of those rare moments in military life when we know these men and women put their lives on the line and we give them a bonus, an imminent danger pay bonus, above their ordinary compensation. One might ask themselves, well, how much is combat pay for those who are serving? Combat pay today is \$150 a month, \$5 a day. Combat pay to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coast Guard is less than the minimum wage for one hour in America for each day they are in battle in harm's way. That was last changed in 1991, when it was raised to \$150.

The amendment I will propose, the imminent danger pay increase amendment, will raise the monthly amount to \$500 a month. Make no mistake,